

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00140 01 OF 04 051505Z

42

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 AECE-00 EB-11 AEC-11

CIAE-00 H-03 INR-10 IO-14 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01

PA-04 PM-07 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15

TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-07 DRC-01 /163 W

----- 019859

P R 051410Z JUL 74

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0262

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0140

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING
OF JULY 3, 1974

REF: A) VIENNA 0133 AND B) VIENNA 0134

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: AT AN ALL DAY JULY 3 MEETING
CHAired BY UK REP ROSE, THE AD HOC GROUP AGREED ON
A PAPER FOR THE NAC ON "DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES"
AND ON A COVERING NOTE AND CHARTS TO ACCOMPANY IT
(TEXTS MBFR VIENNA 133 AND 134). DISCUSSION REVEALED SOME CONTINUING
DIFFERENCES ABOUT HOW THE EAST WOULD REACT TO THE REMOVAL OF
ANOMALIES IN EXISTING ALLIED DEFINITIONS. BUT AHG REACHED A CLEAR
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00140 01 OF 04 051505Z

CONSENSUS THAT A SIGNAL OF ALLIED WILLINGNESS TO ADJUST THEIR

PRESENT DEFINITION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE EAST PRIOR TO THE RECESS AND THAT NAC GUIDANCE ON HOW TO REMOVE ANOMALIES WOULD BE NEEDED BY THE RESUMPTION OF NEGOTIATIONS IN MID-SEPTEMBER. GROUP ALSO APPROVED WITH MINOR CHANGES A PLENARY STATEMENT ON ASSOCIATED MEASURES (MBFR VIENNA 136) AND THE AHG CHAIRMAN'S REPORT FOR THE PREVIOUS WEEK (MBFR VIENNA 132). FRG BILATERALS WITH GDR AND POLAND WERE REPORTED: MAIN POINT OF INTEREST WAS THAT GDR DEPREP THOUGHT PROGRESS IN MBFR MUST FOLLOW CSCE PROGRESS, AND WAS THUS NOT POSSIBLE BEFORE THE SUMMER RECESS. GROUP ALSO ASSESSED JULY 2 INFORMAL SESSION WITH EAST (FULL REPORT MBFR VIENNA 0130 AND 0131), CONCLUDING THAT NO FORWARD MOVEMENT HAD BEEN EXPECTED AND THAT NONE HAD OCCURRED. UK REP EXPRESSED SOME RESERVATIONS ABOUT EARLY USE OF "ALL PARTICIPANTS" FORMULA, AND AHG WILL RETURN TO THIS TOPIC AFTER RECEIVING NAC GUIDANCE. NEXT AHG MEETING SCHEDULED FOR JULY 5. END SUMMARY.

2. FRG DEPREP (HOFMANN) REPORTED ON BILATERAL WITH GDR DEPREP (ERNST). ERNST HAD ASKED WHETHER RECENT USE BY FRG CHANCELLOR SCHMIDT AND DEFENSE MINISTER LEBER OF THE NEW PHRASE "EQUAL-WEIGHTED OUTCOME" REPRESENTED A CHANGE IN FRG POSITION. HOFMANN SAID HE ASSURED ERNST THAT THIS TERM HAD THE SAME MEANING AS THE WORD "BALANCED," SINCE ASYMMETRICAL REDUCTIONS WOULD BE NECESSARY TO PRODUCE AN EQUAL-WEIGHTED OUTCOME. ERNST SAID HE HAD LEARNED OF A SECRET NATO DOCUMENT WHICH SAID THERE WERE 7000 NATO AND 3500 PACT NUCLEAR WARHEADS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. ERNST SAID HE ALSO HEARD OF A NATO COMPUTER MODEL FOR COMPARING FORCE STRENGTHS, EXPRESSED GREAT INTEREST IN IT, AND SUGGESTED IT SHOWED THAT PARITY NOW EXISTED BETWEEN NATO AND PACT FORCES. ERNST SPOKE NEGATIVELY OF THE ALLIED "NO-INCREASE" COMMITMENT, POINTING OUT THAT IT WOULD NOT HINDER EXISTING FRG PLANS TO ADD NEW LEOPARD TANKS AND THAT WESTERN EUROPEANS HAD NO INTENTION OF INCREASING THEIR MANPOWER ANYWAY. FINALLY, ERNST CHARACTERIZED THE NEWS OF CSCE AS "FRUSTRATING AND EVEN DEPRESSING." HE INDICATED THAT THERE COULD BE NO FORWARD MOVEMENT IN MBFR UNTIL AFTER PROGRESS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00140 01 OF 04 051505Z

HAD BEEN MADE ON CSCE; THEREFORE, NOTHING SIGNIFICANT WOULD HAPPEN IN THE REMAINDER OF THE CURRENT MBFR NEGOTIATING ROUND. (COMMENT: ERNST ALSO TOLD US/DELOFF/JULY 4 THAT EAST HAD NO NEW PROPOSALS TO MAKE BEFORE THE SUMMER RECESS. HE FURTHER VOLUNTEERED HIS "INFORMATION" THAT WESTERN AHG MET AT LEAST THREE TIMES PER WEEK AND ALSO HAD TO SEEK REGULAR SUBSTANTIVE GUIDANCE FROM NATO, WHILE WP REPS IN VIENNA MET TOGETHER

ONCE A WEEK AT THE MOST. END COMMENT).

3. FRG REP (BEHREND) REPORTED ON A BILATERAL WITH POLISH REP STRULAK, WHO INSISTED THAT THE CURRENT EASTERN "FIRST STEP" SUGGESTION IS ENTIRELY DIFFERENT FROM THE "SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS" EARLIER PROPOSED BY THE EAST. STRULAK INDICATED THAT INCLUSION OF ARMAMENTS, OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND OF ALL PARTICIPANTS IN INITIAL REDUCTIONS WAS VITAL, BUT SAID THERE COULD BE FLEXIBILITY ON THE SIZE OF SUCH REDUCTIONS PROVIDED SECURITY REMAINED UNDIMINISHED. FRG REP FELT THAT THIS REFLECTED POLISH RATHER THAN SOVIET PRIORITIES. STRULAK ALSO SAID THAT DEPLOYMENT OF THE PLUTON TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPON SYSTEM TO FRENCH ARMY FORCES IN THE FRG (SIC) COULD AFFECT MBFR SIGNIFICANTLY. STRULAK INDICATED THAT THE BULK OF INITIAL REDUCTIONS (I.E. GREATER THAN 50 PERCENT) COULD BE TAKEN BY US AND SOVIET FORCES, AND THAT EACH SIDE WOULD HAVE "RELATIVE FREEDOM" TO ALLOCATE ITS OWN REDUCTIONS AMONG ALLIANCE MEMBERS. WHEN PRESSED ON THE MEANING OF "RELATIVE" IN THIS CONTEXT, POLISH REP SAID THAT ALLOCATIONS WOULD HAVE TO BE AGREED UPON BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES, BUT THAT THIS WOULD BE A MATTER OF COMMUNICATION RATHER THAN NEGOTIATION.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00140 02 OF 04 051649Z

42

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 AEC-11 CIAE-00 H-03

INR-10 IO-14 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 PA-04 PM-07

PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00

RSC-01 NSC-07 EB-11 AECE-00 DRC-01 /163 W

----- 020988

P R 051410Z JUL 74

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 263

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0140

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS
FROM US REP MBFR

JULY 4 PLENARY STATEMENT

4. THE AD HOC GROUP APPROVED WITH MINOR EDITORIAL CHANGES THE PLENARY STATEMENT ON ASSOCIATED MEASURES DELIVERED BY THE BELGIAN REP ON JULY 4, 1974. (TEST MBFR VIENNA 136). AHG DID ACCEPT US REP'S WISH TO RESTORE A SENTENCE (DELETED BY THE DRAFTING GROUP) TO THE EFFECT THAT THE REDUCTION OF US AND SOVIET FORCES WOULD LIMIT THEIR FREEDOM TO REINFORCE IN AN EMERGENCY, THUS MAKING THE NATURE AND INTERPRETATION OF THE ACTIVITIES OF US/SOVIET FORCES REMAINING IN THE REDUCTIONS AREA EVEN MORE IMPORTANT. US REP EMPHASIZED THAT THIS POINT WAS VITAL SINCE THE EAST HAD STRONGLY CRITICIZED THESE ALLIED STABILIZING MEASURES RELATING TO EXERCISES AS UNRELATED TO REDUCTIONS. US REP SAID THE ABOVE REASONING REPRESENTED
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00140 02 OF 04 051649Z

THE ONLY REAL LINK BETWEEN REDUCTIONS AND THE STABILIZING MEASURES RELATED TO MAJOR EXERCISES. WITHOUT THIS ARGUMENT, THE EAST COULD SEEK TO DISMISS THESE MEASURES AS IRRELEVANT. NETHERLANDS REP ACCEPTED THIS POINT, BUT EXPRESSED CONCERN LEST THE SOVIETS ARGUE THAT US AND SOVIET REDUCTIONS PLUS THE NO-INCREASE COMMITMENT MAKE STABILIZING MEASURES APPROPRIATE FOR APPLICATION TO ALL FORCES REMAINING IN THE REDUCTION AREA.

COVER NOTE TO DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES PAPER

5. UK REP (ROSE) GAVE AN EXPLANATION OF THE DRAFT AHG COVER NOTE TO NAC, WHICH HIS DELEGATION PROPOSED ACCOMPANY THE ANALYTICAL PAPER ON THE DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES. HE SAID THAT THE FIRST TWO PARAGRAPHS SET OUT THE PURPOSE OF THE ATTACHED ANALYTICAL PAPER AND THE NEED FOR COUNCIL GUIDANCE ON THE GROUND FORCE DEFINITION PROBLEM BY A PARTICULAR DATE; THE THIRD PARAGRAPH GAVE THE REASONS WHY AN INTERIM NEGOTIATING RESPONSE WAS NECESSARY BEFORE THE SUMMER RECESS; AND THE FOURTH PARAGRAPH OUTLINED THE INTERIM RESPONSE THE AHG INTENDED TO MAKE. ITALIAN REP (CAGIATI) ASKED WHETHER IT WAS APPROPRIATE TO APPEAR TO BE ASKING BRUSSELS FOR GUIDANCE ON AHG TACTICS. RATHER THAN CONVEY THIS IMPRESSION, HE RECOMMENDED THAT THE FOURTH

PARAGRAPH OF THE COVER NOTE WHICH CONTAINED PROPOSED TALKING POINTS FOR PRE-RECESS USE WITH THE EAST BE DROPPED. NETHERLANDS REP (QUARLES) SAID THE AHG WAS NOT SEEKING NAC APPROVAL OF ITS TACTICAL HANDLING OF THE ISSUE, BUT THAT IT WOULD BE USEFUL AND APPROPRIATE TO INFORM THE NAC OF AHG INTENTIONS. MOREOVER, QUARLES DID NOT BELIEVE THE PAPER SUGGESTED THAT THE AHG WANTED GUIDANCE. UK REP AGREED THAT THERE WAS NO INTENT TO ASK FOR GUIDANCE. GREEK REP (DOUNTAS) SUPPORTED THE COMMENTS OF NETHERLANDS REP, STRESSING THE IMPORTANCE OF INFORMING THE NAC. CANADIAN REP (GRANDE) AGREED THAT IT WAS WISE TO INFORM THE COUNCIL, BUT SAID THE AHG SHOULD NOT ASK FOR NAC GUIDANCE ON TACTICAL MATTERS. US REP STATED THAT HIS FEELINGS WERE SIMILAR TO THOSE EXPRESSED BY ITALIAN REP. PARAGRAPH THREE EXPRESSES WHAT THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD IN MIND, THAT OF TELLING THE NAC HOW THE AHG INTENDS TO HANDLE THE ISSUE. THIS
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00140 02 OF 04 051649Z

COULD THEN BE FOLLOWED BY A GENERAL STATEMENT THAT AHG ACTIONS WOULD NOT PREJUDICE NAC DELIBERATIONS. SUCH HANDLING, US REP BELIEVED, WOULD BE MORE IN KEEPING WITH THE AHG'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE NAC AND WOULD AVOID THE POSSIBLE FEELING THAT THE AHG WAS INVOLVING THE NAC IN TACTICAL ISSUES. IT WOULD BE UNFORTUNATE IF THE NAC FELT IT HAD TO COMMENT OR COME UP WITH ITS OWN WORDING OF WHAT THE AHG SHOULD SAY TO THE EAST. FRG REP SUPPORTED RETENTION OF THE FOURTH PARAGRAPH, ON TACTICS, SINCE HE DID NOT THINK ITS INCLUSION WOULD BE INTERPRETED AS A REQUEST FOR NAC GUIDANCE. CHAIRMAN (UK REP) CONCLUDED THAT THERE WAS A GENERAL FEELING IN THE AHG TO RETAIN THE PARAGRAPH.

6. AHG THEN REVIEWED THE TEXT OF THE COVER NOTE. AT SUGGESTION OF US REP, AHG AGREED THAT COVER NOTE WOULD REQUEST NAC GUIDANCE BY SEPTEMBER 16, THE DAY THE AHG RETURNS TO VIENNA FOR THE AUTUMN ROUND OF NEGOTIATIONS.

7. TURNING TO TALKING POINTS IN PARA 4 OF COVER NOTE (REF A), NETHERLANDS REP QUESTIONED WHETHER IT WAS APPROPRIATE FOR THE AHG TO TELL THE EAST THE ALLIES WERE READY TO SEEK A COMMON DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES AT A TIME WHEN THE AHG WAS AWAITING NAC GUIDANCE. US DEPREP SAID THAT HE DID NOT BELIEVE THIS WAS A PROBLEM SINCE THE ALLIES HAVE ALREADY TOLD THE EAST OF WESTERN READINESS TO SEEK A COMMON DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES. AHG AGREED TO RESTATE ALLIED WILLINGNESS TO SEEK SUCH A COMMON DEFINITION.

8. NETHERLANDS REP RAISED THE ISSUE OF HOW MUCH
OF A SIGNAL SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE EAST. TELLING
THE EAST THAT THE ALLIES WERE READY TO RECONSIDER
THEIR GROUND FORCE DEFINITION IN LIGHT OF EASTERN
CRITICISMS COULD IN QUARLES' VIEW, BE GOING TOO FAR,
SINCE THIS WAS A MATTER FOR NEGOTIATIONS. QUARLES
THOUGHT IT WAS SUFFICIENT FOR THE AHG TO TELL THE
EAST THAT THE ALLIES WERE EXAMINING HOW TO DEAL WITH
INCONSISTENCIES OF ORGANIZATION. THE US REP ASSERTED
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00140 02 OF 04 051649Z

THAT IT WAS ESSENTIAL TO GO BEYOND WHAT THE AHG HAD
PREVIOUSLY TOLD THE EAST ON THE ISSUE. FRG REP AGREED
WITH US REP, ARGUING THAT THE ONLY REAL SIGNAL TO THE
EAST WOULD COME FROM SAYING SOMETHING NEW EVEN IF
ONLY A LITTLE MORE. BOTH THE CANADIAN AND ITALIAN

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00140 03 OF 04 051543Z

42
ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 AEC-11 CIAE-00 H-03

INR-10 IO-14 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 PA-04 PM-07

PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00

RSC-01 NSC-07 EB-11 AECE-00 DRC-01 /163 W
----- 020260

P R 051410Z JUL 74
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0264
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
INFO USMISSION NATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0140

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

REPS SUGGESTED THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT APPEAR TO BE RECONSIDERING THE ISSUE BECAUSE OF EASTERN CRITICISMS. US DEPREP NOTED THAT THE TALKING POINTS IN PARA 4 OF THE COVER NOTE INDICATED THAT THE ALLIES WERE PREPARED TO RECONSIDER THE BASIS OF THE DEFINITION, WHEN, IN FACT, THEY ONLY INTENDED TO OFFER TO TRIM THE EDGES OF THE DEFINITION. AFTER FURTHER DISCUSSION, AHG AGREED TO MODIFY THE TEXT IN ORDER TO ELIMINATE POSSIBLE CONFUSION AS TO WHAT THE ALLIES WERE WILLING TO DO AND TO PREMISE THE TEXT UPON RESPONDING TO "INCONSISTENCIES" POINTED OUT BY THE EAST.

ANALYTICAL PAPER ON DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00140 03 OF 04 051543Z

9. AHG NEXT RETURNED TO A DISCUSSION OF THE ANALYTICAL PAPER ON THE DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES, WHICH HAD BEEN REVISED BY THE US DEL PURSUANT TO THE AHG DISCUSSION ON JULY 1 (MBFR VIENNA 0135). NETHERLANDS REP FOUND THE GENERAL APPROACH PUZZLING, SINCE HE UNDERSTOOD THAT POLISH AND CZECH AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL HAD BEEN CLASSIFIED BY NATO AS GROUND FORCES BECAUSE THEY WERE IN FACT GROUND FORCES. USDELOFF (MACEACHIN) EXPLAINED THAT IN FACT THESE POLISH AND CZECH FORCES REPRESENTED A THIRD SERVICE, SEPARATE FROM POLISH AND CZECH AIR AND GROUND FORCES. NETHERLANDS REP RESPONDED THAT IF THIS WERE SO THEN THE ALLIES HAD NOT ADHERED TO THEIR OWN CRITERION FOR DEFINING GROUND FORCES IN CLASSIFYING THESE PERSONNEL. USDELOFF (CLARKE) EXPLAINED THAT NATO HAD TRIED TO DEAL WITH THE DIFFICULTIES POSED BY THIS THIRD SERVICE BY APPLYING THE NATO EXPERIENCE; THE PROBLEM WAS TO INSURE THAT THESE PERSONNEL WOULD BE COUNTED. USDEPREP FURTHER ELABORATED THAT, IN NATO AND PACT FORCES, CERTAIN PERSONNEL IN AIR DEFENSE ARE USED TO MAN ANTI-AIRCRAFT, RADAR AND MISSILES. IN NATO, THERE IS ONLY A DIVISION BETWEEN AIR AND GROUND FORCES. THE PACT, HOWEVER, HAS HOME AIR DEFENSE IN A SEPARATE SERVICE. THE PERSONS ESTIMATING PACT FORCES USED THE NATO DIVISION INTO AIR AND GROUND FORCES TO DIVIDE THESE HOME AIR

DEFENSE FORCES BETWEEN AIR AND GROUND FORCES. US DELOFF (CLARKE) ADDED THAT THE ATTACHED TABLES (MBFR VIENNA 0134) DO NOT REFLECT AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL PLACED IN THE AIR FORCES. AHG AGREED THE ANALYTICAL PAPER SHOULD REFLECT THE FACT THAT POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA ORGANIZE THEIR AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL SEPARATELY FROM ARMY OR AIR FORCES.

10. FRG REP ASKED WHETHER THE USE OF DATA WOULD BE NECESSARY IN PRESENTING CASE 1. US DEPREP SAID THAT THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO INDICATE DESCRIPTIVELY WHAT IS INCLUDED AND WHAT IS EXCLUDED.

11. FRG REP SAID THAT HE DID NOT BELIEVE CASE 2 AGGRAVATED THE NON-CIRCUMVENTION PROBLEM, UNLESS THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00140 03 OF 04 051543Z

SOVIETS INTRODUCED A NEW TANK ARMY AND CLASSIFIED IT AS AIR DEFENSE. US DEP REP SAID THE PROBLEM WAS THAT IF THE AGREEMENT DEALT ONLY WITH GROUND FORCES THERE WOULD BE AN EXCEPTED GROUP WHICH WAS NEITHER AIR NOR GROUND. THUS, THERE IS A POTENTIAL LOOPHOLE. OF COURSE, THE WORDING OF A NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE COULD SOLVE THE PROBLEM BUT NATO SHOULD BE MADE AWARE OF ITS EXISTENCE.

12. A DISCUSSION FOLLOWED ON THE CONCLUSION SECTION OF THE ANALYTICAL PAPER. ITALIAN REP SAID THIS SECTION PARTLY REPEATED AND PARTLY CONTRADICTED THE COVER NOTE. ALLIES HAD MADE A MISTAKE IN FORCE DEFINITION AND SHOULD CORRECT IT. THAT WAS ALL. US DEP REP POINTED OUT THAT THERE WAS A DIVERGENCE OF OPINION IN THE AHG AS TO WHETHER RECATEGORIZATION WAS A MAJOR MOVE OR A SMALL TACTICAL STEP. CONSEQUENTLY, IT WAS APPROPRIATE TO INDICATE THE RANGE OF THINGS THE ALLIES MIGHT EXPECT IN RETURN FOR RECATEGORIZATION.

13. UK REP NOTED THAT WHAT THE ALLIES MIGHT GET IN RETURN FOR GROUND FORCE RE-DEFINITIONS WERE ONLY LISTED AS EXAMPLES. NETHERLANDS REP SAID IT WAS VALUABLE TO DIRECT ATTENTION TO WHAT MIGHT BE OBTAINED IN RETURN; HOWEVER, INCLUSION OF A LIST OF POSSIBLE EASTERN CONCESSIONS MIGHT LEAD THE NAC TO RESPOND WITH RESTRICTIVE GUIDANCE. US DEPREP SAID HE RECOGNIZED THIS POINT, BUT SINCE BOTH THE COVER NOTE AND THE ANALYTICAL PAPER MENTION EASTERN COUNTER-CONCESSIONS, IT WAS IMPORTANT TO GIVE EXAMPLES WHICH SUGGESTED THE RANGE OF POSSIBILITIES. ITALIAN REP SAID THAT THE POSSIBLE EASTERN COUNTER-MOVES LISTED ARE EITHER SO MINISCULE AS TO BE MEANINGLESS OR SO LARGE AS TO BE UNATTAINABLE. US DEPREP POINTED OUT THAT AN EXCHANGE OF DATA WOULD BE SIGNIFICANT, SINCE THE EAST DOES NOT WANT TO

EXCHANGE DATA UNTIL AFTER IT KNOWS THE SHAPE OF
REDUCTIONS. UK REP INDICATED THAT RE-DEFINITION
WOULD HELP KEEP THE FOCUS ON GROUND FORCES. ITALIAN
REP REPLIED THAT THE ALLIES HAD MADE A MISTAKE IN
CATEGORIZATION. CORRECTING IT WAS NOT A CONCESSION
TO THE EAST FOR WHICH A COUNTERMOVE COULD OR SHOULD BE EXPECTED
FROM THE EAST. UK REP RESPONDED THAT, AS HE HAD PREVIOUSLY
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00140 03 OF 04 051543Z

EXPLAINED, PARTICULARLY FROM A MILITARY POINT OF VIEW, THE ALLIES
WERE MAKING A CONCESSION. PURSUANT TO A SUGGESTION
OF FRG REP, IT WAS AGREED TO GIVE EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE
EASTERN COUNTERMOVES.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00140 04 OF 04 051552Z

42

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 ACDE-00 EB-11 AECE-00 AEC-11

CIAE-00 H-03 INR-10 IO-14 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01

PA-04 PM-07 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15

TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-07 DRC-01 /163 W

----- 020356

P R 051410Z JUL 74

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 265

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0140

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

14. UK REP RECOMMENDED THAT THE PAPER BE SENT TO NAC UPON CONCLUSION OF THE JULY 3 AHG MEETING. AFTER SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT THE ADVISABILITY OF HOLDING THE PAPER UNTIL AFTER THE SECRETARY'S BRIEFING TO NAC ON SOVIET VIEWS ON MBFR EXPRESSED AT THE US-SOVIET SUMMIT, AHG APPROVED THE ANALYTICAL PAPER AND COVER NOTE FOR IMMEDIATE TRANSMISSION TO NAC. (TEXT MBFR VIENNA 133 AND 134).

DISCUSSION OF JULY 2 INFORMAL SESSION WITH EAST

15. US REP MADE THREE COMMENTS TO SUPPLEMENT THE WRITTEN REPORT (MBFR VIENNA 130 AND 131). AS ANTICIPATED, THE EAST SAID NOTHING NEW; SOVIET REP KHLESTOV SPENT MOST OF THE TIME TRYING TO
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00140 04 OF 04 051552Z

ESCAPE FROM THE AGREED SUBJECT OF "WHOSE FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED FROM THE OUTSET," BUT DID NOT SUCCEED; AND THERE HAD BEEN SEVERAL EASTERN REFERENCES TO THE UNWILLINGNESS OF NON-US ALLIED DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO COMMIT THEMSELVES TO REDUCE THEIR FORCES. FRG REP COMMENTED THAT IT HAD BEEN THE DULLEST INFORMAL MEETING SO FAR, AND THAT KHLESTOV HAD SAID NOTHING OF SIGNIFICANCE. NETHERLANDS REP POINTED OUT THAT THERE HAD BEEN A NUMBER OF CLARIFICATIONS OF THE EASTERN "FIRST STEP" IDEA, ALL OF WHICH MADE IT APPEAR TO BE EVEN LESS ACCEPTABLE.

16. NETHERLANDS REP WENT ON TO NOTE THAT EASTERN REPS HAD REPEATEDLY CHALLENGED THE UNWILLINGNESS OF THE NON-US WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO COMMIT THEMSELVES TO PARTICIPATE IN PHASE II. HE FELT THE ALLIES SHOULD RESPOND BY MAKING THEIR "ALL PARTICIPANTS" COMMITMENT IN THE NEXT (JULY 9) INFORMAL SESSION. UK REP RESPONDED BY ASKING WHAT ALLIES COULD EXPECT TO RECEIVE IN RETURN. UK REP SAW NO BASIS FOR EXPECTING A QUID PRO QUO FROM THE EAST. NETHERLANDS REP REPLIED THAT THIS WESTERN MOVE WOULD INFLUENCE EASTERN THINKING DURING THE COMING RECESS PERIOD. IF SO, IT MIGHT LEAD THE EAST TO CONCLUDE THAT PHASING COULD BE ACCEPTED WHEN THE TALKS RECONVENE IN SEPTEMBER. IF THE ALLIES DO NOT MAKE THIS MOVE BEFORE THE RECESS, THE EASTERN POSITION ON PHASING MIGHT HARDEN DURING THE REST OF THE SUMMER.

17. FRG REP SUPPORTED NETHERLANDS REP, NOTING THAT

SUCH ALLIED MOVES ARE GENERALLY MOST EFFECTIVE WHEN THE EAST IS GIVEN TIME TO THINK ABOUT THEM. MAKING SUCH A MOVE BEFORE THE RECESS WOULD SHOW THE EAST THAT THE WEST IS STILL DETERMINED TO OBTAIN THE ALLIED PHASING CONCEPT BUT WAS WILLING TO RESPOND TO PRACTICAL PROBLEMS RAISED BY THE EAST. ON THE OTHER HAND, MAKING SUCH A MOVE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT ROUND MIGHT INDUCE THE EAST TO VIEW IT AS THE TIP OF AN ICEBERG-LEADING THE EAST TO BELIEVE THIS WAS ONLY THE BEGINNING OF A NEW SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00140 04 OF 04 051552Z

ALLIED APPROACH WORKED OUT DURING THE SUMMER RECESS. FRG REP WARNED THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD HAVE NO ILLUSIONS ABOUT THE EASTERN REACTION TO THE "ALL PARTICIPANTS" MOVE: THE EAST WILL OBJECT BECAUSE IT DOES NOT SPECIFY THE TIME OR SIZE OF NON-US WESTERN REDUCTIONS. NEVERTHELESS, FRG REP THOUGHT THE MOVE WOULD BE WORTHWHILE BECAUSE IT WOULD MAKE THE ALLIED POSITION ON PHASING MORE DEFENSIBLE. THE ONLY REAL CHOICE WAS WHETHER TO MAKE THE MOVE AT THE INFORMAL SESSION ON JULY 9 OR JULY 16.

18. UK REP REPEATED HIS MISGIVINGS THAT THE EAST WOULD "SWALLOW THE COMMITMENT" AND OBJECT TO THE TIME SCALE, ARGUING THAT IF REDUCTIONS WERE POSSIBLE IN PHASE II THEY WERE POSSIBLE IN PHASE I. ALLIES MUST GUARD AGAINST THIS. AHG AGREED TO RESUME DISCUSSION OF THIS SUBJECT AFTER RECEIPT OF NAC GUIDANCE.

19. IN FURTHER DISCUSSION OF JULY 2 INFORMAL ITALIAN REP DISPLAYED SOME OPTIMISM, WONDERING WHETHER EASTERN INSISTANCE THAT FIRST STEP NEED NOT ADDRESS ALL ISSUES (SEE PARAS 29 AND 30 OF MBFR VIENNA 131) MIGHT NOT INDICATE THAT THE FIRST STEP COULD IN THE END RESEMBLE ALLIED IDEAS FOR FIRST PHASE. US REP AND BELGIAN REP (ADRIAENSSSEN) DISAGREED. US REP POINTED OUT THAT AT THE END OF PARA 31, KHLESTOV HAD CHARACTERIZED THE FIRST STEP IN FAMILIAR EASTERN TERMS. BELGIAN REP REMARKED THAT THE MAIN THING THE SOVIETS WISHED TO SET ASIDE IN THE FIRST STEP WAS THE COMMON CEILING CONCEPT.

20. NEXT AHG MEETING SCHEDULED FOR JULY 5, 1974.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: GROUND FORCES, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, MEETINGS, SUMMIT MEETINGS, ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 05 JUL 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974MBFRV00140
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740178-1123
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740773/aaaackkl.tel
Line Count: 596
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 11
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) VIENNA 0133 AND B) VIENNA 0134
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 20 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <20 MAR 2002 by izenbei0>; APPROVED <09 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING OF JULY 3, 1974
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005